

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 9-13, and 17-18 have been amended, leaving claims 1-18 for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment. Support for the amendments can be found at page 10, line 18 to page 12, line 14. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the Amendment and Remarks set forth herein.

The amendment to claims 2, 3, 10, and 11 are merely to change the "A" to "The" for consistency among the claims. The amendment to claim 12 changes the dependency of claim 12 to claim 9. The dependency to claim 8 was a typographical error. In addition, the change to claim 13 corrects a typographical error.

Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 11-14, and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tornqvist (U.S. 5,133,036) in view of Ishii et al. (US 5,321,536). For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

Claims 1, 3-6, and 17 include the following limitation: "said connection conductor having a section between said second electrode and said signal supply portion, at least a part of said section being a multilayer structure formed of a second electrode material used for said second electrode and a conductive material used for said thin film transistors, said multilayer structure having a resistance lower than a resistance of a single layer of said second electrode material." In addition, claims 9, 11-14, and 18 include the following limitation: "said connection conductor having a section between said second electrode and said signal supply portion, at least a part of said section being formed of a conductive material used for said thin film transistors, said part having a resistance lower than a resistance of a single layer of a material used for said second electrode." As such, the connection conductor structure is provided for reducing conductor resistance. As explained in the specification at page 12, line 11, the resistance value of a connector lying outside the

display area can be suppressed low so that a decrease in display intensity can be decreased. None of the cited references teach or suggest those limitations.

The Examiner recognizes that Tomqvist does not specifically teach connection of a second electrode with a signal supply such that the second electrode is controlled separately from the first electrode. The Examiner asserts that Ishii teaches the use of a first electrode and a second electrode in such a way that the second electrode is controllably connected to and separated from the signal line by the photosensitive section.

However, the Examiner does not set assert that Ishii teaches or suggests either "said connection conductor having a section between said second electrode and said signal supply portion, at least a part of said section being a multilayer structure formed of a second electrode material used for said second electrode and a conductive material used for said thin film transistors" or "said connection conductor having a section between said second electrode and said signal supply portion, at least a part of said section being formed of a conductive material used for said thin film transistors." It is not clear to Applicant how Ishii teaches or suggests the quoted limitations.

Ishii describes that a source line 7 is provided for supplying an image signal to a pixel electrode 6. Ishii also describes that the source line 7 and the pixel electrode 6 are separated by a photosensitive section 8 and that the source line 7 and the pixel electrode 6 are prevented from physically directly contacting one another. There is nothing in Ishii that teaches or suggests that at least part of a section of the connection conductor connection is a multilayer structure formed of a second electrode material used for the second electrode and a conductive material used for said thin film transistors.

Moreover, Ishii does not teach or suggest that the multilayer structure has a resistance lower than a resistance of a single layer of said second electrode material. It appears that, in Ishii's device, when an image (light) is irradiated on the photosensitive section 8 composed of a photoconductive material that changes resistance according to the irradiated light, a change in resistance is generated, in accordance with the image, between the source line 7 applied with a predetermined voltage and the pixel electrode 6. A desired voltage is thereby applied to the pixel electrode 6 via the photosensitive section 8, determining the potential stored between the pixel electrode 6 and the lower electrode 4. As such, the connection structure between the pixel electrode 6 and the source line 7 for supplying an image signal to the pixel electrode 6 is in fact constituted by the photosensitive section 8 disposed therebetween, which functions as the signal input section. There is nothing in Ishii that would teach or suggest that the multilayer structure has a resistance lower than a resistance of

a single layer of said second electrode material. Accordingly, Tornqvist and Ishii do not teach or suggest all of the limitations in claims 1 and 9.

In addition, obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992); MPEP § 2143.01. The Examiner asserts that one would have been motivated in view of the suggestion in Ishii that the desired connection between the electrode and a signal supply as well as separate control of the electrodes can be achieved by Ishii's electrodes configuration with the signal line. Applicant respectfully traverses. There is nothing in Tornqvist that would motivate or suggest that the connection structure of Ishii would be desirable. Ishii's connection structure is completely unrelated to the structure disclosed in Tornqvist.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1, 3-6, 9, and 11-14, and 17-18 are not rendered obvious by the references, individually or in combination thereto. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 7-8, and 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tornqvist in view of Ishiguro et al. (U.S. 6,146,928) ("Ishiguro"). The Examiner states that Tornqvist does not teach a type of thin film transistors containing a polycrystalline silicon layer, an external signal supply device connected to a light emission panel, and conducting materials of conductors in connection to a gate electrode, drain electrode, and source electrode. The Examiner alleges that Ishiguro remedies such deficiencies of Tornqvist.

Claims 2 and 7-8 depend from claim 1 and claims 15-16 depend from claim 9; thus, claims 2 and 7-8 include all of the limitations of claim 1 and claims 15-16 include all of the limitations of claim 9. Thus, claims 2 and 7-8 include all of the limitations of claim 1 and claims 15-16 include all of the limitations of claim 9. As explained above, Tornqvist does not teach or suggest that limitation. Moreover, Ishiguro also does not teach or suggest those limitations. Ishiguro describes supply of power from an external power supply 1010 to an LCD panel, but fails to disclose a connection conductor as recited in claims 2, 7-8, and 15-16.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 2, 7-8, and 15-16 are not rendered obvious by the references, individually or in combination thereto. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: Lisa Bongiovi  
Lisa A. Bongiovi  
Registration No. 48,933  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No. 23413

Date: April 3, 2003